

REMARKS

AMENDMENTS

Claims 1, 5-8, and 10-12 are amended herein, and claim 13 is canceled. The amendments to claims 5-8 and 11 are limited to correcting the typographical error “curred” to read “curved.” In addition to this correction, claims 1 and 12 also replace certain phrases specified by the examiner in the office action. Proposed corrections to the drawings are also included, in which the unlabeled view in Figure 2 is removed, as are the lines A--A, and a schematic “spiral housing” is drawn around the impeller. The specification is also amended to reflect this proposed amendment, as are claims 1 and 10. No new matter is introduced.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102(B)

The examiner rejects claims 1-3 and 5-12 under 35 USC §102(a) as anticipated by the disclosures of Wilson et al. (US 3,012,977), Glass (US 3,322,070), and Weis (US 3,704,868). Applicants respectfully traverse the examiner’s rejection, as not each and every element as set forward in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in each individual prior art reference. (*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987)).

Neither Wilson et al. nor Glass disclose impellers having curved vanes. This element is present in the claims as originally filed, the present amendments only serving to correct typographical errors. While Weis does disclose impellers having

curved vanes, that reference does not disclose flow-through to any extent. Liquid does not flow through the spaces between impeller vanes. Accordingly, none of the cited references anticipates the present claims. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 USC §102(b) be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103(A)

The examiner rejects claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over the disclosure of Wilson, Glass, or Weis, each in view of Wissman (US 4,722,664). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

As indicated above, each of the primary references is deficient in one or more elements required in the present claims, and the examiner has set forward no *prima facie* case of obviousness based on these elements. The Wissman reference only applies to a single element of claim 4, and the examiner has not shown how the other elements of this claim are obvious over the cited prior art. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants consider that the rejections of record have been obviated and respectfully solicit passage of the application to issue.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this



KASTENHUBER et al., Serial No. 10/069,366

paper, including Extension of Time fees to Deposit Account No. 11-0345. Please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KEIL & WEINKAUF

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David C. Liechty".

David C. Liechty
Reg. No. 48,692

1350 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202)659-0100

DCL/kas